

Rejection of Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in light of *Lechot*

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) in light of *Lechot*. Anticipation requires the cited reference to teach each and every element of the claim. See MPEP 2131.01. As discussed in the previous section, Applicants amend Claim 1. *Lechot* does not teach at least one element recited in Claims 1-8, as currently amended, namely, the at least one second portion forming at least one side of the generally dome-shaped surface, not forming a surface of rotation about the rotational axis, located generally more closely to the rotational axis than the first portion, and reducing a dimension of the generally dome-shaped surface in at least one dimension transverse to the rotational axis of the generally dome shape. Applicants also amend Claim 9. Support for the amendments is found throughout the application, as filed, for example, on page 10, lines 10-22 of the specification. *Lechot* does not teach at least the following elements recited in Claims 9, namely, a limitation that the raised edges are confined to an area of the first portion occupying substantially less than half of an area of the generally dome-shaped surface of the reamer, and a limitation that the at least one second portion forms at least one side of the generally dome-shaped surface of the reamer and has no cutting edges. Applicants respectfully assert that the claim amendments overcome the rejection based on *Lechot* and request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of *Lechot* and *Salyer*

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 10-12 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of *Lechot* in combination with *Salyer*. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the references, separately or combined, must teach or suggest all the claim limitation, and the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art. See MPEP 2142. *Lechot* and *Salyer*, separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least the following limitations recited in Claims 10-12, as currently amended: a limitation that the raised edges are confined to an area of the first portion occupying substantially less than half of an area of the generally dome-shaped surface of the reamer, a

limitation that the at least one second portion forms at least one side of the generally dome-shaped surface of the reamer and has no cutting edges, and a limitation that the raised edges are confined to a band straddling a middle portion of the dome-shaped surface of the reamer. Further, there is not suggestion or motivation in *Lechot* or *Salyer* to combine or modify the references as suggested in the Office Actions. Accordingly, *Lechot* or *Salyer*, separately or in combination, fail to render Claims 10-12 *prima facie* obvious at least for the foregoing reasons. Applicants respectfully assert that the claim amendments overcome the rejection of Claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Lechot* in view of *Salyer* and request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed October 20, 2006. No additional fees are believed due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies which may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 11-0855.

Applicants assert that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the application be passed to issuance. If the Examiner believes that any informalities remain in the case that may be corrected by Examiner's amendment, or that there are any other issues which can be resolved by a telephone interview, a telephone call to the undersigned agent at (404) 815-6102 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/elena s. polovnikova/

Elena S. Polovnikova
Patent Agent
Reg. No. 52,130

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
Suite 2800
1100 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6494